



Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes

Journal of medieval and humanistic studies

24 | 2012

Au-delà des miroirs : la littérature politique dans la France de Charles VI et Charles VII

Amending Aquinas: textual bricolage of the *Speculum dominarum* as an authorial strategy in the compilation *Speculum morale*

Tomas Zahora



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/crm/12962>

DOI: 10.4000/crm.12962

ISSN: 2273-0893

Publisher

Classiques Garnier

Printed version

Date of publication: 30 December 2012

Number of pages: 505-524

ISSN: 2115-6360

Electronic reference

Tomas Zahora, « Amending Aquinas: textual bricolage of the *Speculum dominarum* as an authorial strategy in the compilation *Speculum morale* », *Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes* [Online], 24 | 2012, Online since 01 December 2015, connection on 13 October 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/crm/12962> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/crm.12962>

© Cahiers de recherches médiévales et humanistes



Amending Aquinas: textual bricolage of the *Speculum dominarum* as an authorial strategy in the compilation *Speculum morale*

Abstract : In the early years of the fourteenth century, an anonymous author writing under the guise of Vincent of Beauvais compiled the Speculum morale, a compendium of ethics and moral theology that draws heavily on verbatim extracts from the Summa theologiae of Thomas Aquinas along with four other sources. This article explores the compilation strategies of the Speculum morale by focusing on its utilization of a newly identified source, the treatise Speculum dominarum composed for Queen Jeanne of Navarre by her Franciscan Confessor Durand of Champagne. Along with revealing a number of compilation techniques at work, the intertextual relationship between the two specula provides interesting evidence on the reception and transformation of Dominican ideas in a Franciscan milieu.

Résumé : Dans les premières années du XIV^e siècle, un auteur anonyme écrit sous le couvert de Vincent de Beauvais le Speculum morale, un recueil d'éthique et de théologie morale qui s'appuie fortement sur des extraits in extenso de la Somme théologique de Thomas d'Aquin ainsi que sur quatre autres sources. Cet article explore les stratégies de compilation de l'auteur du Speculum morale, en se concentrant sur l'utilisation d'une source nouvellement identifiée, le traité Speculum dominarum composé pour la reine Jeanne de Navarre par son confesseur franciscain Durand de Champagne. En sus de révéler un certain nombre de techniques de compilation, la relation intertextuelle entre les deux specula fournit des informations intéressantes sur la réception et la transformation des idées dominicaines dans un milieu franciscain.

Medieval compilations often challenge and disturb modern notions of text and of authorship as textual ownership. They open up a world in which different methods of acknowledging textual authority and different modes of compiling interact to produce a daunting variety of “re-used” texts. On one hand, Vincent of Beauvais’ *Speculum maius* (c. 1240-1250) a three-volume encyclopedia of natural (*Speculum naturale*), academic (*Speculum doctrinale*), and historical (*Speculum historiale*) knowledge, set the standard for acknowledging sources.¹ On the other, we find compendia in which “originals” are abridged, changed, or reorganized so deftly and covertly that their identification, if possible at all, demands considerable effort. An excellent example of the latter is the *Speculum morale*, an encyclopedia of ethics and moral philosophy composed in the early fourteenth century. While the compiler assumed the name of Vincent of Beauvais and presented his work as part the *Speculum maius*, his compositional methods are quite different: the *Speculum morale* consists for the most part of a re-arrangement of extensive unacknowledged

¹ M. Paulmier-Foucart and M. Duchenne, *Vincent de Beauvais et le Grand miroir du monde*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2004, p. 115-18; G. Guzman, “The Encyclopedist Vincent of Beauvais and His Mongol Extracts from John of Plano Carpini”, *Speculum*, 49, 2, 1974, p. 287-307.

verbatim passages from Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*, along with scholastic and homiletic material drawn from a narrow group of texts. The elaborate interweaving of sources in the *Speculum morale* is a witness to the complexity of contemporary compilation practices. Moreover, its selection and juxtaposition of sources comprises important evidence of the state of reception of two important Dominican sources, Aquinas' *Summa* and Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum maius*, in Franciscan circles. Yet rather than seeking to understand its compositional principles, post-medieval scholarly discussions of the *Speculum morale* have approached the compilation from the perspective of plagiarism and by focusing attention to the "original" sources contributed to the lack of attention paid to it by historians.²

In this paper I will explore the authorial strategies of the compiler of the *Speculum morale* through an examination of a hitherto unrecognized source, the *Speculum dominarum*, a didactic treatise written for Queen Jeanne of Navarre by her Franciscan confessor Durand of Champagne. This newly identified source confirms that the compiler was most probably a Franciscan, and opens the question of textuality and politics of mendicant orders at the beginning of the fourteenth century. On the level of organization, the incorporation of the *Speculum dominarum* reveals compilation methods of fusing together large texts. On the level of meaning, the Franciscan compiler's appropriation of Aquinas' text and assumption of Vincent's name points to the recognition of Dominican intellectual contribution which is nevertheless adjusted by amending perceived gaps in Aquinas with additional material that bears identifiable traces of Franciscan thought. The fact that the *Speculum morale*, aimed at male preachers and scholars, incorporates a treatise written for a female ruler also speaks of the mutual permeability of ideas and genres, and demonstrates that conventional modes of conveying didactic messages could be transformed to suit a range of contexts.

Two mirrors of morals

In its 1624 Douay edition the *Speculum morale* appears as the third of Vincent of Beauvais' four-volume *Speculum maius*.³ Only a brief note informs the reader that the volume contains extensive passages matching Aquinas' *Summa*, which the compiler contracted and enhanced with exempla and statements suitable for moral improvement to form a massive compendium of scholastic, homiletic, biblical and patristic knowledge relevant to virtues, vices, penance, death, and afterlife.⁴ To the monks of St Vaast who oversaw the edition the textual coincidence posed no impediment to publishing the *Speculum morale* as part of Vincent's great encyclopedic project. But by the middle of the seventeenth century the uncertainty

² C. J. Mews, T. Zahora, D. Nikulin and D. Squire, "The *Speculum morale* (c. 1300) and the study of textual transformations: a research project in progress", *Vincent of Beauvais Newsletter*, 35, 2010, p. 5-15.

³ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum quadruplex sive Speculum maius: Speculum naturale, Speculum doctrinale, Speculum morale, Speculum historiale*, 4 vols., Douay, Balthazar Bellerius, 1624.

⁴ Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum morale, tomus tertius Speculi maioris*, Douay, Balthazar Bellerius, 1624, preface: *Ea quae S. Thomas in 2. parte Summe diffuse tractat per questiones, aut hoc contraxit ad institutum concionum, additis, vbi videbatur commodum, sentiis, exemplis, & considerationibus ad vitam pie formandam idoneis.*

regarding the exact direction of textual borrowing began to be viewed against recently refined discussions of plagiarism, and the implied possibility of Aquinas plagiarizing Vincent cast an uncomfortable shadow of doubt on the Angelic Doctor.⁵ This doubt motivated the Dominican scholar Jacques Echard to undertake an extensive study of the encyclopedia. His analysis, published in 1708 as *The Summa of Saint Thomas reclaimed for its author, or dissertation on the writings of the Venerable Brother Vincent of Beauvais*, put all suspicions of Aquinas' plagiarism to rest.⁶ Apart from establishing that by far the largest part of the *Speculum morale* is a direct compilation of two Dominican works, Thomas Aquinas' *Prima* and *Secunda Secundae* (hereafter 1a 2ae, and 2a 2ae) and Étienne de Bourbon's *Tractatus de diversis*, Echard showed that it also draws on verbatim passages from the anonymous treatise *De consideratione novissimorum*, as well as on extracts from the commentaries on the *Sentences* by the Franciscan Richard of Middleton and the Dominican Peter of Tarentaise (Innocent V).⁷ The *Speculum morale*, Echard triumphantly concluded, was composed neither by Vincent nor by Thomas, but by an anonymous compiler in the early decades of the fourteenth century. As Serge Lusignan has pointed out since, versions of all five sources were available by 1294-1297, which would place the composition of the *Speculum morale* well after the death of either Vincent or Aquinas.⁸

In the process of analyzing the *Speculum morale*, Echard noticed a number of subtle changes to the source material, in particular in the extensive verbatim borrowing from Étienne de Bourbon's *Tractatus*. The compiler incorporated the name of Francis where the original only mentions Dominic, in addition to erasing or changing references to Dominican friars, and adding specifically Franciscan exempla and extracts from vitae.⁹ As a result the *Speculum morale*, although circulated under the name of a Dominican and comprised for the most part of material composed by Dominicans, possesses a palpable Franciscan voice. This makes the *Speculum morale* an interesting piece of evidence in the reception of Thomist thought in Franciscan circles. Following the chapter of 1282, Franciscans were only allowed to use Aquinas with the accompaniment of William de la Mare's *Correctorium fratris Thomae*. The inclusion of passages from the commentary on the *Sentences* by the Franciscan Richard of Middleton, who despite being influenced by Aquinas nevertheless offers a reading perceived as more moderate, may thus very

⁵ P. Lécivain, "La *Somme Théologique* de Thomas d'Aquin aux 16^e-18^e siècles", *Recherches de science religieuse* 91, 3, 2003, p. 397-427; P. Harrison, 'Religion' and the religions in the English Enlightenment, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002, p. 137; Z. Kaluza, "Auteur et plagiaire: quelques remarques", *Was ist Philosophie im Mittelalter?*, ed. J. Aertsen and A. Speer, Berlin, De Gruyter, 1998, p. 312-20.

⁶ J. Echard, *Sancti Thomae Summa suo auctori vindicata sive de V. F. Vincentii Bellovacensis scriptis dissertatio*, Paris, Delespine, 1708; T. Zahora, "Thomist Scholarship and Plagiarism in the Early Enlightenment: Jacques Echard (1644-1724) Reads the *Speculum morale*, Attributed to Vincent of Beauvais", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, forthcoming, 2013.

⁷ J. Echard, *op. cit.*, 100-398. Of the major sources of the *Speculum morale*, only the work of Étienne de Bourbon is available in a partial critical edition: *Tractatus de diversis materiis*, ed. J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, Turnhout, Brepols, 2002-2006.

⁸ S. Lusignan, *Préface au Speculum maius de Vincent de Beauvais: réfraction et diffraction*, Montreal, Bellarmin, 1979, p. 77-90.

⁹ J. Echard, *op. cit.*, 472-90.

well be the compiler's response to discussions arising from that requirement.¹⁰ Publishing the encyclopedia under the *auctoritas* of the Dominican Vincent, apart from increasing the likelihood of its survival and dissemination, could have also provided a channel for communicating a message that might otherwise be seen as too controversial.

The three books of the *Speculum morale* contain 837 *distinctiones* and extend to 1558 columns in the Douay edition. The organization of the *Speculum* corresponds to a division of themes into human actions and virtues, the four last things (death, last judgment, punishment of the wicked, and blessed souls), and sin and penance (Table 1). The compilation relies heavily on the *Summa* for both structure and content. A typical *distinctio* contains a transcription of a selected cluster of Aquinas' *responsiones* in identical or slightly changed order, along with homiletic material and exempla relevant to the subject drawn primarily from Étienne de Bourbon. Occasionally the text of the *Summa* is juxtaposed with passages from Richard of Middleton and Peter of Tarentaise, or an entire *distinctio* is drawn from Étienne de Bourbon.¹¹

Table 1: Structure of the *Speculum morale*

Books and themes	Parts and themes (numbers in brackets refer to the number of distinctiones in each part)
1. Human actions and virtues	1. On human actions and passions of the soul (34)
	2. On law and divine grace (15)
	3. On virtues in general, as well as theological and cardinal virtues (104)
	4. On the gifts of the Holy Spirit and beatitudes (23)
2. The last things	1. On death (13)
	2. On the last judgment (11)
	3. On the punishment of the wicked (6)
	4. On the beatitudes of the body and soul (4)
3. Sin and penance	1. Things preventing sin (10)
	2. Sin in general (21)
	3. Pride and its daughters (31)
	4. Envy and its daughters (7)
	5. Anger and its daughters (14)
	6. Acedia and its daughters (15)
	7. Avarice and its daughters (19)
	8. Gluttony and its daughters (4)
	9. Voluptuousness and its daughters (6)
	10. Penance (39)

¹⁰ P. Glorieux, éd. *Les Premières polémiques thomistes: I. - Le Correctorium corruptorii 'Quare'*, Kain, Le Saulchoir, 1927; B. Kent, *Virtues of the Will: The Transformation of Ethics in the Late Thirteenth Century*, Washington, D.C., The Catholic University of America Press, 1995, p. 10.

¹¹ Echard provides a thorough list of relevant passages in *op. cit.*, p. 353-98.

The effect, as Echard observed in frustration, can be stylistically and compositionally jarring.¹² Yet the *Speculum*'s use of sources is not incompatible with compilation methods practiced in the Late Middle Ages.¹³ The number and variety of compilations of the *Summa* itself is perhaps the best illustration of the fact that the more successful a work became, the more likely was its transformation through selective copying and abridgment.¹⁴ Vernacular translations – versions of Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum* are a good example – likewise reveal a rather fluid approach to "originals."¹⁵ In addition, while generally accepted *auctoritates* would usually be cited, references to more recent sources or standard references, even in extensive verbatim borrowing, were not pursued as rigorously. Pierre d'Ailly's *Imago mundi*, for instance, relies in crucial passages made famous by Columbus on unacknowledged borrowing from Roger Bacon; and the extent, in his commentary on the *Sentences*, of unacknowledged borrowing from Ockham has led Monica Calma to use the term textual bricolage as a way of capturing the reliance on other texts and the freedom to amend them exercised by medieval scholars.¹⁶ Viewed in the context of late-medieval textual production, the *Speculum morale* is a formidable effort to bring together a number of different individual voices and genres into a single compendium of scholastic and homiletic material.

A new insight into the perceived utility of the *Speculum morale* was offered by Anne Dubrulle in her critical edition of the *Speculum dominarum*, a work of moral instruction composed for Queen Jeanne of Navarre by her Franciscan confessor Durand of Champagne. Dubrulle discovered an extensive textual coincidence between the two texts: roughly one third of the *Speculum dominarum* matches the *Speculum morale* word-per-word in what she interpreted as Durand's

¹² E.g. J. Echard, *op. cit.*, 359: *In una & eadem distinctione sunt articuli sibi succedentes ac proximi sibi invicem contradictorii, adeo ut quod D. Thomas stabilit in priori qui illius est, id evertat Ricardus de Mediavilla in posteriori qui est ejus.*

¹³ A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd ed., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania University Press, 2010; R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse, "Ordinatio and Compilatio Revisited", *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, ed. M. D. Jordan and K. Emery Jr., Notre Dame, Ind., Notre Dame University Press, 1992, p. 113-34; S. Wenzel, "The Continuing Life of William Peraldus' *Summa vitiatorum*", *Ad litteram: Authoritative Texts and Their Medieval Readers*, *op. cit.*, p. 135-63; N. Hathaway, "Compilatio: from Plagiarism to Compiling", *Viator*, 20, 1989, p. 19-44; A. J. Minnis, "Late-Medieval Discussion of *Compilatio* and the Role of the Compiler", *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 101, 3, 1979, p. 385-421; M. B. Parkes, "The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Development of the Book", *Medieval Learning and Literature: Essays Presented to R. W. Hunt*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander and M. T. Gibson, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1976, p. 115-41.

¹⁴ Leonard E. Boyle, "The *Summa Confessorum* of John of Freiburg and the Popularization of the Moral Teachings of Thomas and of Some of his Contemporaries", *St Thomas Aquinas 1274-1074: Commemorative Studies*, ed. A. A. Mauer, Toronto, PIMS, 1974, p. 254-68.

¹⁵ P. Di Stefano, "Preliminari per un'edizione critica del Libro del governmento dei re e dei principi", *Medioevo Romano*, 9, 1984, p. 65-84.

¹⁶ P. Moffitt Watts, "Prophecy and Discovery: On the Spiritual Origins of Christopher Columbus's 'Enterprise of the Indies'", *The American Historical Review*, 90, 1, 1985, p. 73-102, at 82; M. B. Calma, "Plagium", *Mots médiévaux offerts à Ruedi Imbach*, ed. I. Atucha, D. Calma, C. König-Pralong, and I. Zavattero, Porto, Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, 2011, p. 559-68.

borrowing from the latter work.¹⁷ An act of historical irony, Dubrulle's finding implied that Durand, rather than considering the *Speculum morale* an awkward work of a plagiarist as viewed by Echard, used it extensively in his treatise for aristocratic women. Suddenly, the *Speculum morale* became associated with the substantial tradition of books of instruction composed for the French royalty that includes the *Speculum animae* dedicated to Blanche of Castile, the wife of Louis VIII¹⁸; *De morali principis institutione* composed for Louis IX and Thibaut of Navarre, and *De eruditione filiorum nobilium* for Louis' wife Marguerite, both by the Dominican Vincent of Beauvais¹⁹; *La Somme le roi* by Laurent of Orleans, Vincent's confrere and the confessor of Louis' son Philip III²⁰; and *De regimine principum* by the Augustinian friar Giles of Rome, dedicated to Philip IV, Jeanne of Navarre's husband.²¹

Durand's work covers many of the same issues as the *Speculum morale*, although the style is homiletic rather than scholastic. The first and longest of the three treatises that comprise it addresses the woman's natural condition, her condition as determined by fortune, and the effects of grace through an exploration of grace as such, moral qualities, passions of the soul, and virtues. The second treatise is devoted entirely to a discussion of women's wisdom, while the third discusses the various aspects of the queen's life through an elaborate use of the

¹⁷ A. Dubrulle, "Le *Speculum dominarum* de Durand de Champagne", 2 vols., Thèse présentée pour l'obtention du diplôme d'archiviste-paléographe, École Nationale des Chartes, 1987-88, p. 82-92. Altogether, Dubrulle identified sections in 58 chapters that corresponded verbatim with the text of 30 *distinctiones* of the *Speculum morale* (23 in book one, out of a total of 176 *distinctiones*, and 7 in book three, out of a total of 166). The common passages cover the themes of human vileness (*Speculum dominarum* 1.1.3-1.1.6; *Speculum morale* 1.3.100), the misery of women (*Speculum dominarum* 1.1.15; *Speculum morale* 3.2.11), human passions (*Speculum dominarum* 1.3.1.2-14, 16-18; *Speculum morale* 1.1.9, 12-18, 23-26, 30, 34; 3.3.18; 3.4.1; 3.5.1), virtues (*Speculum dominarum* 1.4.1, 17, 20, 21, 35, 39, 40; *Speculum morale* 1.3.1, 35, 38, 88, 90, 100), wisdom and peace (*Speculum dominarum* 2.2-25; *Speculum morale* 1.4.6, 22), mercy (*Speculum dominarum* 2.29; *Speculum morale* 1.4.20), deliberation (*Speculum dominarum* 2.30; *Speculum morale* 3.4.5), and prayer (*Speculum dominarum* 3.1-4; *Speculum morale* 3.10.33, 34).

¹⁸ S. L. Field, "Reflecting the Royal Soul: the *Speculum animae* Composed for Blanche of Castile", *Medieval Studies*, 68, 2006, p. 1-42; S. L. Field, "From *Speculum animae* to *Miroir de l'âme*: The Origins of Vernacular Advice Literature at the Capetian Court", *Medieval Studies*, 69, 2007, p. 59-110.

¹⁹ Vincent of Beauvais, *De eruditione filiorum nobiliorum: frater Vincentius de ordine praedicatorum, qualiscumque lector in monasterio suo de Regali monte*, ed. A. Steiner, Cambridge, Mass., The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1938; Vincent of Beauvais, *De morali principis institutione*, ed. R. J. Schneider, Turnhout, Brepols, 1995; R. J. Schneider, "Vincent of Beauvais' *Opus universale de statu principis*: a Reconstruction of its History and Contents", Vincent de Beauvais: Intentions et réceptions d'une œuvre encyclopédique au Moyen Âge, ed. M. Paulmier-Foucart, S. Lusignan, and A. Nadeau, Ville Saint-Laurent, Bellarmin, 1990.

²⁰ Laurent d'Orléans, *La 'Somme le Roi' par frère Laurent*, ed. E. Brayer and A.-F. Leurquin-Labie, Paris, Société des textes français modernes, 2008.

²¹ C. F. Briggs, Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum*: Reading and Writing Politics at Court and University, c. 1275-c.1525., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

mnemonic image and metaphor of four kinds of houses: exterior, interior, inferior, and superior.²²

The ideal queen portrayed in the *Speculum dominarum* is enjoined to become an example to her subjects through moral improvement and perfection, but also encouraged to leave her mark on the working of the government, whether through influencing courtiers, facilitating petitioners' access to the court, or perambulating the kingdom and listening to the people's complaints.²³ In this, Durand's ideal differs significantly from that of Giles of Rome's *De regimine principum*, which dwells on the queen's inferior moral and intellectual qualities and presents her as someone who needs to be ruled and managed.²⁴ The recognition of the queen's public role likewise distinguishes the *Speculum dominarum* from the much shorter *Speculum animae* whose message, while centered on women, is one of detachment from worldly politics.²⁵ Durand's message certainly did find its audience. While only a single Latin manuscript survives, a French translation, possibly by Durand himself, is extant in 12 manuscripts which circulated among noble families well into the fifteenth century.²⁶

Unlike the author of the *Speculum morale*, Durand of Champagne is not anonymous, and Dubrulle's discovery promised to illuminate the milieu in which the *Speculum morale* was read and perhaps even composed. Durand's activities at the

²² Hereafter, the Latin text will be referred to as *Speculum dominarum*, with relevant *tractatus*, *pars*, *distinctio*, and *capitulum* followed by page number in Dubrulle's edition (e.g. *Speculum dominarum* 1.1.1, p. 4). For an outline of the *Speculum dominarum*, see C. J. Mews, "The *Speculum dominarum* (*Miroir des dames*) and Transformations of the Literature of Instruction for Women in the Early Fourteenth Century", *Virtue Ethics for Women 1250-1500*, ed. K. Green and C. J. Mews, Dordrecht, Springer, 2011, p. 13-30; A. Dubrulle, *op. cit.*, 1:1-7; and C. L. Mastny, "Durand of Champagne and the 'Mirror of the Queen': A Study in Medieval Didactic Literature", Ph.D. Diss., Columbia University, New York, 1969, p. 171-81.

²³ C. J. Mews, *op. cit.*; R. Lahav, "A Mirror of Queenship: The *Speculum dominarum* and the Demands of Justice", *Virtue Ethics for Women 1250-1500*, *op. cit.*, p. 31-44; C. Ledsham and C. J. Mews, "Franciscan Thinking about Charity, Practical Theology and Salvation 1275-1320", *Interpreting Francis and Clare of Assisi, From the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. C. J. Mews and C. Renkin, Melbourne, Broughton, 2010, p. 152-76.

²⁴ Giles of Rome, *De regimine principum libri III*, Rome, Antonius Bladus, 1561, 2.1.6, p. 141: *Nam nunquam est dare communitatem aliquam bene ordinatam, nisi aliquid sit ibi dirigens, et aliquid directum: vel nisi aliquid sit ibi principans, et aliquid obsequens. Quare cum in communitate maris et foeminae, mas debet esse principans, et foemina obsequens: in communitate vero patris et filii, pater debet esse imperans, et filius obtemperans; in communitate quidem domini et servi, dominus debet esse praecipiens, et servus ministrans et serviens, in domo perfecta (ut vult Philosophus I Politicorum) sunt tria regimina, unum coniugale, secundum quod vir praeest uxori: aliud paternale, secundum quod pater praeest filio: tertium dominantivum et despotivum, secundum quod dominus praeest servis; ibid., 2.1.10, p. 148: *In coniugio enim primo reservatur ordo naturalis: nam naturale est feminam esse subiectam viro, eo quod vir prudentia et intellectu sit praestantior ipsa*. See Paulette L'Hermite Leclercq, "La femme dans le *De regimine principum* de Gilles de Rome", *Guerre, pouvoir et noblesse au Moyen Âge. Mélanges en l'honneur de Philippe Contamine*, éd. J. Paviot and J. Verger, Paris, Presses de l'université de Paris-Sorbonne, 2000, p. 471-79.*

²⁵ S. L. Field, "Reflecting the royal soul", *op. cit.*

²⁶ J. Pinder, "A Lady's Guide to Salvation: The *Miroir des dames* Compilation", *Virtue Ethics for Women 1250-1500*, *op. cit.*, p. 45-52; C. J. Mews, *op. cit.*, 22-25.

French royal court between the 1290s and 1305 coincided with Philip's conflict with Pope Boniface VIII, in which Durand sided with the king.²⁷ They also brought him into the midst of the trial of the Franciscan friar Bernard Delicieux, during which Durand used his connections to provide information regarding the position of the King and served as a conduit between the Queen and his confreres who opposed the excesses of the Dominican-led inquisition in the Languedoc.²⁸ Considering that Philip IV's own preference appeared to be with the Dominicans, a high-level commission such as the *Speculum dominarum* presented an opportunity to showcase his craft as a Franciscan preacher and a pedagogue. As a Franciscan aware of the tension between the mendicant orders and the politics at the court and his own order, Durand would have to have very good reasons to borrow from the heavily Dominican *Speculum morale* – except he did not have to.

Dubrulle's claim for the direction of borrowing is an excellent illustration of the difficulties facing modern researchers attempting to unravel the levels of intertextuality buried in medieval compositions. For textual comparisons with the *Speculum morale* Dubrulle relied on the Douay edition, which gives the impression of a continuous text with no hints of the internal composition of the encyclopedia. Its references only cover those recognized as *auctoritates* (e.g. the Bible, St. Bernard, Gregory the Great) in passages excerpted from immediate sources like Aquinas. Without access to Echard's detailed analysis, Dubrulle did not observe that the text she recognized matches none of the sources identified by Echard, and that several passages of the *Speculum dominarum* are in fact lodged within identifiable sections of Aquinas and Étienne de Bourbon and thus demonstrate that it was the author of the *Speculum morale*, not Durand, who compiled the text using techniques consistently applied throughout the work. In other words, Dubrulle's discovery of textual coincidence has not just shed new light on the two works: it has contributed to the identification of a previously unknown source of the *Speculum morale*, and thus to a better understanding of the methods used by its compiler.

Textual bricolage and fusion of documents

In order to understand how the compiler of the *Speculum morale* utilized the *Speculum dominarum*, it is best to begin with Echard's study – provided we are aware that his primary interest is in restoring the original texts to their proper owners, not in seeking to understand the creation of meaning that results through rearrangement.²⁹ Echard's comments on the compiler's methods describe a process

²⁷ U. Neumann, "Sacerdos sine scientia est sicus ductor cecus...: Postulate zur charakterlichen und wissenschaftlichen Bildung des Beichtigers in der ^{Summa} *Collectionum pro confessionibus audiendis* des Durand von Champagne O.F.M. – Einführung und Text", *Universität und Bildung, Festschrift Laetitia Boehm zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. W. Müller, W. J. Smoka and H. Zedelmaier, Munich, PS-Serviceleistungen für Geisteswissenschaft und Medien, 1991, p. 33-44; L. Delisle, "Durand de Champagne, Franciscain", *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, 30, Paris, Imprimerie nationale, 1888, p. 302-33; E. Martène and U. Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, Paris 1717, 1 : col. 1268; C. L. Mastny, *op. cit.*, 60-61.

²⁸ A. Friedlander, "Processus Bernardi Delitiosi: The Trial of Fr. Bernard Délicieux, 3 September – 8 December 1319", *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series* 86, 1, 1996, p. 116, 124, 266-67; C. J. Mews, *op. cit.*, 14-17; C. L. Mastny, *op. cit.*, 65-70.

²⁹ T. Zahora, *op. cit.*

very much like the textual bricolage techniques outlined by Calma: using verbatim clusters of text as “bricks”, the compiler selectively abridged, reorganized, and juxtaposed them with alternating passages.³⁰ For instance, in the distinction on the effect of fear (*Speculum morale* 1.1.28), the compiler reordered the text of Étienne de Bourbon while amending and excising some passages:

Distinctio 29, on the effect of fear column 104, almost all things from Brother Étienne, p. 1, titulus 2, ‘on the 25 kinds of effects of the fear of the lord,’ from fol. 142, col. 1 to fol. 143, col. 1. Vincentiaster changes the order, adds a few things, and eliminates some.³¹

Echard’s sensitivity to genres and individual authors’ styles led him to identify a number of individual styles, including a “moral” one, typified by Étienne de Bourbon, which often accompanies the scholastic passages appropriated from the *Summa*.³² But he also detected traces of another moralizing voice, which he assigned to the compiler whom he calls Vincentiaster or false, plagiarizing Vincent.³³ Its style left him unimpressed: whatever the compiler added on his own hardly compared with, and was often inconsistent with the more pure voice of Aquinas.³⁴ Feeling no admiration for the plagiarist, Echard took the perspective of original sources and effectively disassembled the compilation into its constituent parts. Rather than gathered into a separate section, his comments on the passages identified with Vincentiaster are scattered in sections dedicated to Aquinas or Étienne de Bourbon. Together, though, the moral additions of dubious value – including an extended passage on zeal to which he refers as a “minor moral excursus” and which matches verbatim the *Speculum dominarum* – form a very close match to the text identified by Dubrulle. With his extensive memory and experience, it is unlikely that Echard would have forgotten about the *Speculum dominarum*; he was most probably not familiar with it. We are thus left with a remarkable match between passages Echard attributed to Vincentiaster and the text identified by Dubrulle, which in the *Speculum morale* behaves just like the other five sources and is appropriated, in extracted and rearranged clusters, to fit the encyclopedia’s format.

On several occasions excerpts from the *Speculum dominarum* are inserted into identifiable sections of the two largest sources of the *Speculum morale*, the *Summa theologiae* and the *Tractatus de diversis*. In the *Speculum morale*’s discussion of humility, the text of the conclusion of Aquinas’ 2a 2ae, q.161, a.2 is

³⁰ E.g. J. Echard, op. cit., p. 305 : *Hic alternatim ex lib. de 7. donis, & ex S. T.*

³¹ D. 29. *de effectu timoris col. 104. fere omnia ex F. S. p. 1. tit. 2. de 25 effectibus timoris domini in genere a fol. 142. col. 1. ad fol. 143. col. 1. Vincentiaster ordinem invertit, pauca addit, quaedam resecat, (ibid., p. 117).*

³² *Hic Vincentiaster deserit S. T. & excursionem moralem de effectibus timoris Dei ex F. S. transcribit, (ibid., p. 290).*

³³ E.g. 1.1.9 *de amore al quod multiplex est genus amoris. Hic articulus proprius est Vincentiastri, nisi aliunde corraserit, at ejus certe nihil ad S. Thomam, (ibid., p. 283).*

³⁴ In article 5 of *Speculum morale* 1.3.90, *de perseverantia*, (corresponding to 2a 2ae, q. 137), Echard notices difference of style: *excursio est moralis styli à Summa theologiae omnino abhorentis, cujus auctor nondum occurrit. Solum Vincentiastri divisiones rhythmicas adverte. Debemus perseverare in operando, in tolerando, in pugnando, et in orando, &c. Haec sane digna erant, quae Summae theologiae ratiociniis jungerentur.*

interrupted with a passage from St Bernard together with an explanation that matches exactly the text in the *Speculum dominarum* (Table 2).³⁵

Table 2: Insertion of *Speculum dominarum* into the *Summa theologiae*

2a 2ae, q.161, a.2, co.	<i>Speculum morale</i> 1.3.100 (cols. 538-39); passages coinciding with the <i>Speculum dominarum</i> in bold font
<p><i>Dicendum, quod sicut dictum est ad humilitatem proprie pertinet, ut aliquis reprimat seipsum ne ferant in ea, quae sunt supra se. Ad hoc autem necessarium est, ut aliquis cognoscat id in quo deficit a proportionem eius quod suam virtutem excedit. Ideo cognitio proprii defectus, pertinet ad humilitatem, sicut regula quaedam directiva appetitus: sed in ipso appetitu consistit humilitas essentialiter, et ideo dicendum est, quod humilitas est proprie moderativa motus appetitus.</i></p> <p>(a2 ad 3) <i>Et nota, quod in fortitudine invenitur eadem ratio refraenandi audaciam, et firmandi animum contra timorem, utriusque ratio ex hoc est, quod homo debet bonum rationis, periculis mortis praeferre.</i></p>	<p><i>Dicendum, quod sicut dictum est ad humilitatem proprie pertinet, ut aliquis reprimat seipsum ne ferant in ea, quae sunt supra se. Ad hoc autem necessarium est, ut aliquis cognoscat id in quo deficit a proportionem eius quod suam virtutem excedit. Ideo cognitio proprii defectus, pertinet ad humilitatem, sicut regula quaedam directiva appetitus: sed in ipso appetitu consistit humilitas essentialiter, et ideo dicendum est, quod humilitas est proprie moderativa motus appetitus. Est igitur humilitas, sicut ait Bern. virtus, qua homo verissima sui cognitione sibi ipsi vilescit. Nam cum homo semetipsum sine dissimulatione considerat, considerando sine adulatione se iudicat, veraciter iudicando nihil se reputat apud Deum, parum valere, in multis [539] offendere, et facere pauca bona, talis cognitio facit hominem sibi vilescere, et in parvitatem propriam resilire. Psal. 118. In veritate tua humiliasti me.</i></p> <p><i>Et nota, quod in fortitudine invenitur eadem ratio refraenandi audaciam, et firmandi animum contra timorem, utriusque ratio ex hoc est, quod homo debet bonum rationis, periculis mortis praeferre.</i></p>

A similar insertion from the *Speculum dominarum* occurs in *Speculum morale* 3.3.11 (*de peccato in generali*), where it amends Aquinas' discussion of punishment due specifically to women (2a 2ae, q.164, a.2).³⁶

The compiler resorted to a more involved use of the *Speculum dominarum* in *Speculum morale* 1.1.26, in the distinction dealing with fear and audacity (*de timore et audacia*), which draws on Aquinas and Étienne de Bourbon.³⁷ First, a passage on mundane fear drawn from Étienne is likewise amended by an insertion from the *Speculum dominarum* that mentions Pontius Pilate (Table 3). After a few paragraphs of copying Étienne verbatim the compiler decided to adjust the Dominican friar's text yet again: this time by using only part of his description of human fear and replace it with a more elaborate description, once more coinciding with the

³⁵ *Speculum morale* 1.3.100, col. 538; 2a 2ae, q.161, a.2 co., ad3.

³⁶ *Speculum dominarum* 1.1.15, p. 26-27.

³⁷ 1a 2ae, q. 41, a.1-4; Étienne de Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus*, BnF, lat. 15970, Paris, f. 142ra-143ra, corresponding to J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, eds. *Tractatus de diversis materiis predicabilibus: prologus, prima pars de dono timoris*, by Stephanus de Borbone, Turnhout, Brepols, 2001, p. 38-44.

Speculum dominarum.³⁸ The remainder of the chapter is a near-verbatim compilation of the *Tractatus de diversis*.

Table 3: Insertion of the *Speculum dominarum* into the *Tractatus de diversis*

<i>Tractatus de diversis</i> 1.1.1	<i>Speculum morale</i> 1.1.26 (col. 79)
<i>Similiter Herodes occidens pueros, volens occidere Iesum, timens ne auferret ei regnum. Matth. 2. Item Iudei, Io. 11, Ne forte veniant Romani, et tollant locum, etc. Non sic Tobias faciebat, qui potius volebat amittere temporalia, quam opera misericordie dimittere, Tob. 1.</i>	<i>Similiter Herodes occidens pueros, volens occidere Iesum, timens ne auferret ei regnum. Matth. 2. Item Iudei, Io. 11, Ne forte veniant Romani, et tollant locum, etc. Pilatus timens amittere praesidentie dignitatem, Christum tradidit ad mortem [...] Cumque carnis subsidia reservanda trepidus praeparat, ab alimentis misericordiae animam necat: et cum in terra pati inopiam metuit, aeternam sibi abundantiam supernae resectionis abscindit. Non sic Tobias faciebat, qui potius volebat amittere temporalia, quam opera misericordie dimittere, Tob. 1.</i>

This segmented incorporation of the *Speculum dominarum* is complemented with a more large-scale fusion on structural level. A comparison of the descriptions of human passions in the *Speculum morale* and *Speculum dominarum* reveals that they share structural elements with Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*. All three works begin with a discussion of the passions in general, and continue with concupiscible and irascible passions. This is the structure that William Peraldus employed in his *Summa vitiorum and virtutum*, and Thomas Aquinas developed in his commentary on the *Sentences* before expanding it to its fullest extent in the *Summa theologiae*.³⁹ But while the *Speculum morale* follows the *Summa* nearly exactly, Durand's outline avoids detailed treatment of the causes and effects of each passion. In addition, Durand's list introduces the passions of abomination, joy, and zeal, which are not independently covered as passions by Aquinas. The compiler's use of the two documents shows he used both the similarities and the differences in fusing the relevant passages together. After selecting relevant passages, he "zipped" them together so that selected passages follow in a unified manner. If we place the *Summa theologiae* and the *Speculum dominarum* side-by-side and, following the order of each work's chapters, compile a digest that combines the *responsiones* of Aquinas with additional information from Durand, we will get something very much resembling the *Speculum morale* (Table 4).

Table 4: Passions of the Soul in the *Speculum morale*, *Summa theologiae*, and *Speculum dominarum* (bold font indicates textual match between the *Speculum morale* and the *Speculum dominarum*)

³⁸ *Speculum morale* 1.1.26, col. 80; J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

³⁹ J. Inglis, "Aquinas' Replication of the Acquired Moral Virtues: Rethinking the Standard Philosophical Interpretation of Moral Virtue in Aquinas", *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 27, 1, 1999, p. 3-27.

<i>Speculum morale</i>	<i>Summa theologiae</i>	<i>Speculum dominarum</i>
1.1.5. De operum principio intrinseco (de passionibus animae in generali section begins)	1a 2ae, q.22. De passionibus in generali	1.3.3.1. De passionibus in generali
1.1.6. De passionum differentia	1a 2ae, q.23. De passionum differentia ad invicem	
1.1.7. De passionum animae bonitate et militia	1a 2ae, q.24. De bono et malo circa passiones animae	
1.1.8. De passionum animae ordine	1a 2ae, q.25. De ordine passionum ad invicem	
1.1.9. De amore (de passionibus concupiscibilis section begins)	1a 2ae, q.26. De passionibus animae in speciali; primo de passionibus concupiscibilis; primo utrum amor sit in concupiscibili	1.3.3.2. De passione amoris
1.1.10. De causa amoris	1a 2ae, q. 27. De causa amoris	
1.1.11. De effectibus amoris	1a 2ae, q.28. De effectibus amoris	
1.1.12. De odio	1a 2ae, q.29. De odio	1.3.3.3. De passione odii
1.1.13. De desiderio	1a 2ae, q.30. De concupiscentia	1.3.3.4. De passione desiderii
1.1.14. De abominatione		1.3.3.5. De passione abhominacionis
1.1.15. De delectatione	1a 2ae, q.31 De delectatione	1.3.3.6. De delectatione
1.1.16. De causis declarationum	1a 2ae, q.32. De causis delectationis	
1.1.17. De effectibus delectationis	1a 2ae, q.33. De effectibus delectationis	
1.1.18. De bonitate, vel malitia delectationum	1a 2ae, q.34. De bonitate et malitia delectationum	1.3.3.6. De delectatione
1.1.19. De dolore, et tristitia	1a 2ae, q.35. De dolore et tristitia	
1.1.20. De causis doloris	1a 2ae, q.36. De causis tristitiae	
1.1.21. De effectibus doloris, vel tristitiae	1a 2ae, q.37. De effectibus doloris vel tristitiae	
1.1.22. De remediis doloris, vel tristitiae	1a 2ae, q.38. De remediis doloris seu tristitiae	
1.1.23. De bonitate vel malitia doloris vel tristitiae	1a 2ae, q.39 De bonitate et malitia doloris vel tristitiae	1.3.3.7. De dolore; 1.3.3.9. De tristitia
1.1.24. De gaudio		1.3.3.8. De gaudio
1.1.25. De spe et	1a 2ae, q.40 De passionibus	1.3.3.10. De spe; 1.3.3.11.

desperatione (de passionibus irascibilis section begins)	irascibilis; primo de spe et desperatione	De desperatione
1.1.26. De timore et audacia	1a 2ae, q.41. De timore et de audacia	1.3.3.12. De timore
1.1.27. De objecto timoris	1a 2ae, q.42. De objecto timoris	
1.1.28. De causa timoris	1a 2ae, q.43. De causa timoris	
1.1.29. De effectu timoris	1a 2ae, q.44. De effectibus timoris	
1.1.30. De audacia	1a 2ae, q.45. De audacia	1.3.3.13. De audacia
1.1.31. De ira	1a 2ae, q.46. De ira	1.3.3.14. De ira; 1.3.3.15. De mansuetudine; 1.3.3.16. De invidia
1.1.32. De causa effectiva irae	1a 2ae, q.47. De causa effectiva irae	
1.1.33. De effectibus irae	1a 2ae, q.48. De effectibus irae	
1.1.34. De zelo		1.3.3.17. De zelo

The insertion of the *Speculum dominarum* into a scheme determined by Aquinas' *Summa* is an ingenious shortcut that speaks to the compiler's familiarity with the two texts and the flexibility with which he approached them. Not wary of adding to the *Summa*, he freely amended and complemented its scholastic discourse with moral excursions and relevant passages from patristic and medieval auctoritates, and even extended moral discourses found in Durand's treatise. Because the organization of the *Speculum dominarum* made it amenable to a fusion of the two documents, rather than just being a source of random moral comments, the work actually plays an important supplementary role in the compilation's structure and contents.

Creating a composite discourse

The compiler's fusion of the *Speculum dominarum* with the bulk of the *Speculum morale*'s other sources, in particular the *Summa*, brought its share of challenges. Aquinas structured his *Summa* in an order that began with the will (1a 2ae, q.8-21), continued with the passions (1a 2ae, q.22-48), and then moved to habits, inclusive of virtues (1a 2ae, q.55-67) – which are then the subject of a much more detailed treatment in 2a 2ae. Thus hope, for instance, is discussed both as a passion of the irascible appetite (1a 2ae, q.40) and as a virtue (2a 2ae, q.17-22). While Durand was familiar with the *Summa* his treatise follows different priorities, and his discussion of passions does not elaborate on the distinction between irascible and concupiscible powers of the soul.⁴⁰ His discourse is homiletic rather than

⁴⁰ *Speculum morale* 1.1.24, col. 69; *Speculum dominarum* 3.3.8, p. 140-41: *Delectatio enim esse potest de omnibus que concupiscimus sive secundum sensum, sive secundum rationem. Gaudium autem proprie non esse nisi de hiis que secundum rationem appetimus. Unde in*

scholastic: when discussing the soul, for instance, he compares it the moon in its changeability, and focuses not so much on the classification of passions in terms of psychology but on their praiseworthiness or damnability.⁴¹

In order to use Durand's definitions and accompanying examples, the compiler had to fit them into the Aquinian superstructure, and thus to choose to include them either in the section on passions or on virtues. Durand's text consistent with the structure of the *Summa* was copied in the same order, as in the case of the passions of the soul we have seen above, and also of virtues; others, such as vices contrasted with opposite virtues, were moved to the discussion of vices in *Speculum morale* book 3.⁴² In other places, the reorganization of sources resulted in repetition. The compiler copied Durand's discussion of joy as a passion, but joy appears again as a virtue following Aquinas' scheme, and yet again as an effect of the theological virtue of charity.⁴³ Similar dilemmas arose when he fused the *Speculum dominarum* into segments of Étienne de Bourbon's *Tractatus de diversis*.⁴⁴ To illustrate the discourse that resulted from the bricolage of different approaches to structure and discussion of material, I will examine the *Speculum morale*'s treatment of prudence, wisdom, and zeal.

The discussion of prudence in *Speculum morale* marks the beginning of the treatment of cardinal virtues.⁴⁵ The *distinctio* begins with several definitions of prudence compiled from Étienne's *Tractatus* and Durand's *Speculum dominarum*, each characterized by its own principles of division. Out of Étienne's twelve kinds of prudence the compiler retained five (natural, improperly used or abusive, mundane, carnal, and just), to which he added three of Durand's (of the heart, of the mouth and of works).⁴⁶ Following the definitions is a digest of Aquinas' responses to

brutis animalibus bene est delectatio, non autem gaudium. In habentibus vero rationem, de omnibus de quibus potest esse gaudium potest esse delectatio, sed non e converso. Quandoque enim aliquis sentit delectationem secundum corpus de qua tamen non gaudet secundum rationem; et sic patet quod delectatio est in plus quam gaudium. Cf. 1a 2ae, q. 31 a. 3 co.: Sed nomen gaudii non habet locum nisi in delectatione quae consequitur rationem, unde gaudium non attribuimus brutis animalibus, sed solum nomen delectationis. Omne autem quod concupiscimus secundum naturam, possumus etiam cum delectatione rationis concupiscere, sed non e converso. Unde de omnibus de quibus est delectatio, potest etiam esse gaudium in habentibus rationem. Quamvis non semper de omnibus sit gaudium, quandoque enim aliquis sentit aliquam delectationem secundum corpus, de qua tamen non gaudet secundum rationem. Et secundum hoc, patet quod delectatio est in plus quam gaudium. See also R. Lahav, op. cit., p. 35-36.

⁴¹ *Speculum dominarum* 3.3.1, p. 105: *Sicut enim luna continue mutatur et numquam in eodem statu permanet, nunc cornuta, nunc gibbosa, nunc dimidia, nunc plena, sic anima in suis affectionibus jugiter et multimode variatur; ibid.*, p. 106: *Harum quedam de se videntur esse laudabiles, ut misericordia, verecundia et zelus. Quedam de se vituperabiles, ut invidia et odium – vituperabile est nisi sit odium viciorum.*

⁴² E.g. hope, *Speculum dominarum* 3.3.10, p. 171.

⁴³ The text in *Speculum morale* 1.3.29, *De gaudio*, is compiled from the *responsiones* of articles in 2a 2ae, q. 28.

⁴⁴ E.g. *Speculum morale* 3.5.1, cols. 1165-1175, which comprises *Speculum dominarum* 3.3.14, p. 190-197 and Étienne de Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis*, f. 424-33.

⁴⁵ *Speculum morale* 1.3.35.

⁴⁶ Étienne's division of prudence reads as follows: 1. *abusive/perversorum*; 2. *subversorum a fide hereticorum*; 3. *hypocritarum/phariseorum*; 4. *vanorum et presumencium philosophorum*;

questions regarding prudence.⁴⁷ For the most part, the Aquinas section is a straightforward and complete compilation of *responsiones* with a few passages from responses to arguments – yet even here the compiler has slightly adjusted the text. He chose not to include the conclusion of article 3 (*utrum prudentia sit cognoscitiva singularium*) and moved the conclusion of article 9 (*utrum sollicitudo pertineat ad prudentiam*) to the discussion of *sollicitudo* in *Speculum morale* 1.3.41.

The compilation of texts on prudence displays an inclination towards economy, as in the abridgment of Étienne's variety of divisions of prudence; and a willingness to reorder its major source, the *Summa theologiae*, to fit the encyclopedia's own structural pattern. The *Speculum dominarum* in this case presents a different, and compared to Étienne quite simple and economical, way of thinking about prudence – a useful alternative, interesting or important enough for the compiler to include in his encyclopedia. Although the styles of Durand and Étienne are complementary, their respective divisions of prudence are based on independently conceived principles. The sense of stylistic disunity, noted by Echard, is further increased by the juxtaposition of the distinct form of Aquinas' *Summa*. Thus, rather than attempting a synthesis the compiler simply presents pared down versions of three different paradigms that his sources represent.

Wisdom in the *Speculum morale* is discussed in two places, following Aquinas, who treated it as one of intellectual virtues,⁴⁸ and as one of the Gifts of the Holy Spirit.⁴⁹ Since Durand presented wisdom as one of the effects of grace, the compiler's choice to use extensive passages from the *Speculum dominarum* in the second discussion of wisdom as a spiritual gift make perfect sense, and the *distinctio* is in its entirety a fusion of the *Summa theologiae* and the *Speculum dominarum*.⁵⁰ The opening passages of the compiled text are a verbatim copy of the *responsiones* of articles 1-5 of 2a 2ae, q.45, with the remainder of the *distinctio* relying in turn entirely on the *Speculum dominarum*. Although the *Speculum morale* draws on Durand's chapters for content, the structure is slightly changed. Durand's twenty-six chapters and eight thematic sections become two large groupings, one dealing with dignity and comprising Durand's sections 8, 2, 7, and 5, and another with its utility and effects, comprising part of Durand's sections 2, 3, 4, and 6 in their entirety. Apart from providing transitions, the compilation restructures Durand's ordering by first distinguishing different types of wisdom, then explaining reasons for its pursuit, acquisition, expression, and finally discussing its usefulness and effects. The compiler also moved Durand's *Summary* of the kinds of wisdom from the conclusion to the beginning of the section (Table 5).

5. *mundanorum*; 6. *carnalis et animalis*; 7. *verbalis et superficialis*; 8. *theorica*; 9. *mechanicorum/practice*; 10. *naturalis*; 11. *rationalis*; 12. *justorum* (*Tractatus de diversis*, f. 547vb-549va).

⁴⁷ 2a 2ae, q.47.

⁴⁸ 1a 2ae, q.57, corresponding to *Speculum morale* 1.3.3.

⁴⁹ 2a 2ae, q.45, corresponding to *Speculum morale* 1.4.6.

⁵⁰ *Speculum morale* 1.4.6.

Table 5: Wisdom (*sapientia*) in the *Speculum dominarum* and the *Speculum morale* (the order of Durand's sections is indicated by numbers in brackets)

<i>Sapientia</i> in the <i>Speculum dominarum</i>	<i>Donum sapientie</i> in the <i>Speculum morale</i>
1. Why it is necessary	A. Whether it is a Gift of the Holy Spirit B. In whom wisdom exists as if in a subject C. Whether wisdom as a gift is speculative or practical D. Whether wisdom can coexist with mortal sin E. Whether the Gift of Wisdom is present in all those who have grace
2. Reasons for its pursuit (<i>nihil preciosius, speciosius, delectabilius, honorabilius, fructuosius</i>)	F1 On the dignity of wisdom: (8). kinds of wisdom (<i>terrena, animalis, dyabolica, desursum descendens</i>)
3. Utility of wisdom (<i>in conferendis consiliis, proferendis judiciis, perferendis molestiis, propellendis injuriis, praecavendis insidiis</i>)	F2 (2). Reasons for its pursuit (<i>nihil preciosius, speciosius, delectabilius, honorabilius</i>)
4. Recognition of things through wisdom (<i>ea quae supra, intra, circa, infra nos</i>)	F3 (7) Acquisition (<i>audiendo, legendo, meditando, orando</i>)
5. Expression in humans (<i>requiescit in corde, declaratur in locutione, monstratur in conversatione, probatur in operatione</i>)	F4 (5) Expression in humans (<i>requiescit in corde, declaratur in locutione, monstratur in conversatione, probatur in operatione</i>)
6. We ought to (<i>ordinare presencia, recordari preterita, providere futura</i>)	G1 On its utility and effects: (2+3). utility of wisdom (<i>nihil fructuosius + utilitas in conferendis consiliis, proferendis judiciis, perferendis molestiis, propellendis injuriis, praecavendis insidiis</i>)
7. Acquisition (<i>audiendo, legendo, meditando, orando</i>)	G2 (4) Recognition of things through wisdom (<i>ea quae supra, intra, circa, infra nos</i>)
8. Kinds of wisdom (<i>terrena, animalis, dyabolica, desursum descendens</i>)	G3 (6) We ought to (<i>ordinare presencia, recordari preterita, providere futura</i>)

Such rearrangement of a source is consistent with editorial practices the compiler applied when adjusting the text of Étienne de Bourbon's *Tractatus* and, to a lesser extent, the *Summa theologiae*. The *Tractatus* may also help explain why the *Speculum dominarum* was used here. In its present form, Étienne's work is incomplete, containing only disquisition on the first five gifts of the Holy Spirit

beginning with fear – intellect and wisdom are missing.⁵¹ The treatment of wisdom in the *Speculum dominarum*, one of the treatise's strongest points, is more than appropriate as a source for filling the gap in the *Tractatus*. Moreover, given the relative brevity of Durand's style, the compiler could use the entirety of his text with some rearrangement rather than choosing passages from a work as tortuous as Étienne's.

The chapter on zeal⁵² is together with that on joy⁵³ unique in that it is a direct copy of continuous text from the *Speculum dominarum*. A comparison with Étienne and Aquinas, whose works the compiler did not use in this instance once more reveals the probable rationale for using Durand's work. Aquinas treats of zeal as an effect of love arising from love's intensity and acknowledges two kinds of zeal: one arising from concupiscence (zeal of jealous husbands or zeal of those driven to excellence through envy), and another from friendship (the zeal of friends towards one another, the zeal of one moved by the love of God).⁵⁴ Although zeal figures in several places in the *Summa* – as in the discussion of envy⁵⁵ and contention⁵⁶ – only one article⁵⁷ is specifically dedicated to the subject, and even here zeal is described not as a separate passion of the soul but as effect of one, namely love. Étienne of Bourbon likewise doesn't mention zeal under a dedicated section but as part of a larger discussion of the desirable characteristics of priests.⁵⁸

Given his predilection for ready-to-excerpt texts, it makes sense that the compiler of the *Speculum morale* would choose a model that did not require much adjustment. In this case the *Speculum dominarum*, which dedicates an entire chapter to zeal, was an ideal candidate. In a relatively brief but autonomous chapter, Durand proposes five types of zeal: envy, love, intense love of husband for his wife, emulation, and finally the zeal of holy men, the "vehement movement of the soul" for the salvation of souls which Christ himself effected.⁵⁹ With Durand's text, the *Speculum morale* has gained a description of the passion that reflects a particularly Franciscan view of zeal, in addition to the broader sense of respect for women evident in the *Speculum dominarum*.

The examples of prudence, wisdom, and zeal show that the borrowing from the *Speculum dominarum* works on a number of levels. On one hand, it provides homiletic discourse that balances the philosophical treatment of virtues and vices in the *Summa*. In that sense its role is similar to that of Étienne's *Tractatus*, whose strengths are extended homiletic discourse and the wealth of exempla, both of which

⁵¹ J. Berlioz and J.-L. Eichenlaub, *op. cit.*, p. xli-xliii.

⁵² *Speculum morale* 1.1.34.

⁵³ *Speculum morale* 1.1.24.

⁵⁴ 1a 2ae, q.28, a.4 co.

⁵⁵ 2a 2ae, q.26, a.2.

⁵⁶ 2a 2ae, q.38, a.2.

⁵⁷ 1a 2ae, q.28, a.4.

⁵⁸ Étienne de Bourbon, *Tractatus de diversis*, fol. 603ra: *Primus zelus quem debent habere prelati debet esse zelus compassionis animarum pereuntium [...]; ibid.*, fol. 604ra: *Secundus zelus quem debent habere prelati est in reprehensione et conneccione peccatorum utili et constanti, ad hec enim debent eos monere sacra scriptura et sanctorum exempla, documenta et instituta; ibid.*, fol. 404va: *Tercius zelus prelatorum debet esse ut se opponant contra mala que sunt in hoc mente, resistendo malis hominibus extirpando mala et puniendo.*

⁵⁹ Dubrulle, *op. cit.*, p. 212.

the *Speculum morale* liberally exploits. The *Speculum dominarum* also provides content for areas not covered by Étienne in his planned but never written books on the gifts of intellect and wisdom. Most importantly, the *Speculum dominarum* provides an extended coverage of themes whose utilization in the *Speculum morale* amounts to an unambiguous emendation of the *Summa*: the notion of joy and spiritual joy drawn from Durand's extensive discussion of the queen's interior house, the elaborate discussion of wisdom, as well as the separate treatment of zeal as a passion of the soul. The involved use of the *Speculum dominarum* shows that the compiler was closely acquainted with its contents and placed it at a level of *auctoritas* comparable to Aquinas and Étienne de Bourbon, using the strengths of Durand's work to give a distinctive Franciscan stamp to his own.

This does not mean that the compilation's use of sources is seamless and its compositional principles easily discernible. The *Speculum morale*'s treatment of wisdom in particular seems to take little account of Aquinas' subtlety. Where the Dominican master insists on a break between wisdom as a gift of the Holy Spirit and wisdom as a virtue that can be achieved by human effort – a distinction that is copied in the *Speculum morale* – the addition from the *Speculum dominarum* introduces an alternative division. Durand's description of wisdom as something that is both received and acquired, and something that is worthy and useful, not only introduces a taxonomy that differs from Aquinas'; his notion of wisdom also appears to cross the boundaries between gift and acquired virtue.

Although such juxtaposition of mutually incompatible taxonomies in the *Speculum morale* may strike the modern reader as illogical, the apparent lack of unifying principles only makes evident the difficulty of synthesizing the wealth of medieval paradigms of representing moral thought. It reminds us of the difference between, on one hand, the orderly teleologies created by theologians, and on the other the multifarious and often incongruous, chimerically multiplying divisions of distinctions created and re-created by the preachers. The inclusion of the *Speculum dominarum* within the *Speculum morale* shows that having access to a variety of multi-paradigmatic streams had its value. In that, the *Speculum morale* is a witness to the range of approaches to Christian ethics as understood, transformed, and performed by actual priests talking to actual people.

Conclusion: Durand's Franciscan voice in the Speculum morale

In the preface to another of his works, the compilation *Summa collectionum pro confessionibus audiendis*, Durand noted he put it together for clerics who do not have the means to purchase, or the time to read many books.⁶⁰ The *Speculum morale* does a similar thing. It literally provides a digest of Aquinas' 1a 2ae and 2a 2ae, with amendments drawn from Richard of Middleton and Peter of Tarentaise, along with homiletic and exemplary literature sourced from Étienne de Bourbon and the *Tractatus de consideratione novissimorum*. To these five sources we must now add Durand of Champagne's *Speculum dominarum*. Durand's work provides the compiler an organizational platform compatible with the *Summa*, as well as a wealth

⁶⁰ [...] qui tantam librorum multitudinem ex quibus collecta sunt habere prae paupertate non possent, vel [quibus] propter occupationes varias studere vel perlegere [non] liceret [...], (L. Delisle, *op. cit.*, p. 304).

of homiletic material and exempla relevant to topics not covered by Étienne's *Tractatus*, in particular those relevant to joy, zeal, patience, humility, wisdom and prayer.

The use of the *Speculum dominarum* confirms the chronology of the composition of the *Speculum morale* proposed by Echard and Lusignan. If Durand composed his work between c. 1297 and 1305, the *Speculum morale* was most likely completed by the first or second decade of the fourteenth century. Since Durand died in 1314, he may have known the compiler, or even himself contributed the creation of the encyclopedia. Most probably a Franciscan or a group of Franciscans close to the French royal court used Durand's work together with excerpts, drafts, and other sources, and presented it as the work of Vincent of Beauvais, the favored encyclopedist of the royal family. On the other hand, recognizing the *Speculum dominarum* as a source refocuses our attention to the sections employed in the *Speculum morale* which, rather than plagiarized, reveal how Durand could be read by his contemporaries. Further study of the presentation of material and interplay of ideas in Durand's *Summa collectionum pro confesionum audiendis* should lead to further insights, especially in light of his expression of difficulty of integrating different genres of writing and paradigms.⁶¹

The Franciscan voice in the *Speculum morale* is but one among several, and not necessarily separated along congregational lines. On the notion of poverty, for instance, a crucial element for Franciscans, the compiler of the *Speculum morale* relied not on a Franciscan source but on Étienne de Bourbon – because despite being a Dominican his treatment of poverty is more thorough than that of Durand's *speculum* written for a queen.⁶² The *Speculum dominarum* contributed material relevant to women, consistent with the Franciscan involvement in women's pastoral care. The inclusion of discourse on joy and zeal, which exceeds anything the compiler could find in Aquinas and Étienne de Bourbon, can also give us a sense of the difference between Franciscan and Dominican approaches to passions of the soul and virtues. Still, our understanding of the Franciscan voice which Durand represents is only tentative prior to a more detailed study of another major Franciscan source of the *Speculum morale*, the commentary on the *Sentences* by Richard of Middleton.

Finally, the utilization of the *Speculum dominarum* brings us closer to the identification of the compositional methods of pseudo-Vincent, whom Echard accused of plagiarism and scholarly negligence, but who is (or are) revealed to be much more interesting. The subtle transformation of Aquinas' thought to which the interplay of the *Speculum morale* and the *Speculum dominarum* bears witness is an excellent example of the power of adapting an existing paradigm. By co-opting the *Summa* into his encyclopedia, by presenting it as the work of a respectable encyclopedist who by the beginning of the thirteenth century was rising to the level of an *auctoritas*, and modifying its contents in ways that may seem awkward but are actually quite effective, the author of the *Speculum morale* has managed to project his own, altered vision of ethical knowledge and implied power relationships. The

⁶¹ B. Roest, *Franciscan literature of religious instruction before the Council of Trent*, Leiden, Brill, 2004, p. 305.

⁶² *Speculum morale* 1.3.104; J. Echard, *op. cit.*, p. 126-28.

wisdom his encyclopedia exhibits may be borrowed, but the work itself is a remarkable example of the use of compilation as an authorial strategy.

Tomas Zahora
Monash University